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Hittite “Heteroclite” s-Stems

It is a great pleasure to take part in this tribute to Alan Nussbaum, whom I have known for more than forty years, since the days of “Room B” in Harvard’s Widener Library, and from whom I have learned much about Indo-European. The following essay, offered as a modest token of friendship and esteem, not only builds on work of Alan, but also benefited greatly from his generous and helpful criticism, which in this instance he furnished without knowing where the article would appear. Needless to say, the usual disclaimers apply with particular force in this case.

I argued in Melchert 1994:150–1 that beside the highly productive heteroclite type of neuter verbal action/result nouns in -ešar, -ešn-, Hittite also attests a more limited number of neuter s-stems in -e/iš-, -e/išn-, i.e. with zero in the nominative-accusative vs. -n- in the weak cases: e.g. tunnakkıš, tunnakkıšn- ‘inner chamber’. Rieken (1999:386–404 with references) upheld this basic claim, offering a more complete review of the material (including some doubtful cases not discussed here).

As indicated by Rieken (1999:387), the zero/-n- class is internally diverse. There are at least two deverbal stems in -eki: takšiš- ‘assemblage’ < takš- ‘put together’ and ḫaddar- (or ḫattar-) ‘(road) fork’ or ‘intersection’ < ḫattariye- ‘to prick’ (with a ḫattar-implement). There are likewise at least two denominative stems in -iš- from i-stems: dandukiš-* ‘mortality’ < danduki- ‘mortal’ and ḫār-ıš- ‘lung’ (beside ḫār-). Hitt. kuppıš(n)- ‘stool’ must also reflect a stem in *iš- in view of CLuv. kuppıš-. Hitt. atesi- ‘axe, hatchet’ continues a hysterokinetic s-stem *adlı-ıš- *‘that which cuts’ (thus with Rieken 1999:192–3, modifying Cop, contra Melchert 1994:150).1 Membership in the -e/iš(n)- class is proven by the secondary animate a-stem nominative atešı́anai (like GIŠbatalkı́naı́ to GIŠbatalkı́š(n)- ‘hawthorn’). A weak stem *atešın- (with gemination of the ň before a consonant) is also the only way to account for the geminate in the secondary animate stem ateša- (of the type of nepiša- next to nepiš- ‘heaven’).2

GIŠbat(ı́)aı́sh(n)- ‘hawthorn’ is a compound of *ḥadı́sh- (cognate with OIr. adı́ ‘hawthorn’ < PIE *h2e(d)b-) and an s-stem *a=kı́š- seen also in Hitt. a=kıša- ‘branch’; see

1For the root specifically as *adlı- see Pinault 2004:142–4, comparing Skt. mābhi- ‘axe, hatchet’.

2There is no gemination of ň after a short accented vowel, contra Rieken 1999:192: see the counterexamples given in Melchert 1994:152. Nor is atešı́anai “völlig korrupt.” It is merely another example of the well-attested use of the nominative in a list, despite its syntactic role as a direct object.
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Watkins 1993:245–7. One may also with Hoffner (1966:38–2) compare for the basic structure the other plant name tapalkuštan(a). The coexistence of *alkiš- and *alkšt¬, the suffixation by *-to-, and a secondary stem in -tan- (undoubtedly reflecting the Anatolian reflex of the PIE “individualizing” *-g/on-) is characteristic for Luvo-Hittite: compare *kumstuall- beside kumšallam- and *Kumšalla- (with Tischler 1983:643 and 646–7), further hûrpašta-/hûrpaštan- beside *hûrpašta- ‘leaf, peel’ (Puhvel 1991:406 with references), and gûlš- beside giš[*gullušťa]ma- (Starke 1990:117).

The comparison of hûrpašta- with Lat. uerbēna ‘twig, leafy branch’ and -uverbustus ‘beaten with twigs’ suggests that Anatolian inherited an s-stem *h₂/h2/werpš-e/os- ‘bundle of boughs’ (i.e. a small bush or individual boughs tied together, used for flogging). As Alan Nussbaum reminds me, however, Lat. uerbēna and -uverbustus show possessive semantics, while the Luvo-Hittite stems in -ta mean ‘belonging to, of’: *alkiš- ‘bush’ > alkišt¬-ta- ‘branch’; *hûrpašš- likewise *bush, leafy plant > hûrpašša- ‘leaf’. The Anatolian extensions by *-to- are thus an independent innovation, and we may assume on structural grounds that alkiš(n)-* belongs to our class of heteroclitic s-stems, as confirmed by the nom.-acc. sg. giš[halkšš] ‘hawthorn’ in KUB 12.4.4 iii 5.

I am deeply indebted to Alexis Manaster Ramer for having discovered and shared with me his illuminating etymology for Hitt. alkiš(n)- (see for a summary of the previous unsatisfactory suggestions Puhvel 1984:36). Manaster Ramer adduces Skt. aḷgā-, attested in the dual aḷgāh ‘groin’ (see Mayrhofer 1986–2001:1.128 with references). It is clear from the dual that the groin is being viewed as the place where the two legs fork (compare the use of Eng. ‘crotch’ for both humans and trees). We may therefore with Manaster Ramer assume a PIE root *h₂elg- ‘to fork, branch’, from which was formed a neuter s-stem ‘branching’, concretized in my view to ‘branching plant, bush, small tree’.

Oettinger (1986:30–31 n. 51) already cautiously compared the Hittite type with that of Skt. āṣa-, āṣ-n-dā, āṣ-n-ē, āṣ-n-dā ‘mouth’ (beside pure s-stem ablative āsā [āsā ā] and instrumental āsā and also loc. sg. āsāni and āsāmi). Rieken (1999:386–7 and 4-3) renews the comparison, although she then confuses matters by citing also Sanskrit and Greek

---

1 Old Script acc. sg. alkištan argues that the stem alkišš- is older than alkišt¬-
2 The hapax acc. sg. ta-pul-ši-ta-na-an in KUB 24.14 1 6 could reflect an animate n-stem tapalkuštan- or secondary a-stem tapalkuštan-.
3 The secondary use in the sense ‘belonging to’ of a suffix with originally possessive semantics is well attested in Anatolian. The suffix *-wén- becomes the productive means of forming ethnic adjectives in Luvian and Lycian (XWI[Nima]tr-wém(i)- ‘of Niniveh’, TIELE-wém(i)- ‘of Tralles’). Similarly, *-to- in Lyd. tei-seta-means ‘of the right-hand side’, not ‘having right-sidedness’.  
4 I must add that Manaster Ramer himself holds different views from me regarding the morphology and semantics of the Hittite words containing *alkiš-.
5 This derivation seems to me both formally and semantically superior to that from a root *(H)alk- putatively attested in Skt. *a 순간- ‘root tendril’, as contained in the plant name pṳlkša-, for which see Mayrhofer 1986–2001:1.92. I personally would keep separate Grk. λαπερός ‘loins, flanks’ and retain its connection with words for ‘soft, slack’. See Chantraine 1968–80:601 and Frisk 1960–72:2.68. The specific meaning ‘crotch’ argues strongly against the proposal of Burrow (1945:85) to connect aḷgāh with various Dravidian words meaning ‘loins, groin’ and similar.
infinitives reflecting *-sen(i). Whatever the status of the latter (see further below), it is clear that the morpheme boundary in the ‘mouth’ type and in the Hittite heteroclite s-stems is between the -s- and the -n-, so these can have nothing to do with a putative suffix *-ser/-sen- (for separation of the two see already Nussbaum 1986:198 n. 3).8

Rieken’s attempt (1999:403) to derive the attested group of Hittite stems in -eš(n)- from ordinary proterokinetic s-stems is also unsatisfactory, because it cannot explain the variation in the vocalism. If one begins with the directly reconstructable inflection R(č)-S(os), R(č)-S(es)- and assumes leveling of the weak suffixal form *-es- to the strong stem, then Hittite would show only -iš from post-tonic *-es, as in nēpiš- ‘sky, heaven’ (Melchert 1994:139). If one starts from an internally reconstructed R(č)-S(s), R(ţ)-S(ţs)- following Schindler (1973a:264–6) and likewise leveling of the weak suffixal form *-es- to the strong stem, one would predict only -eš (compare Zucha 1988:229 n. 6).

It is true, of course, that the only examples with -iš of clear derivation are secondary to i-stems (*dandsukš-, bardıvíi-), but these would never have been attracted to the heteroclite type unless some of the latter had the shape -iš. Rieken herself has provided the basis for an explanation in her analysis of Gĩš karzan- ‘swift, niddy-noddy’.9 Eichner (1973:98 n. 78) had derived the word from a virtual holokinetic *ḥėrt-sör, k(e)rt-sısn- to the root *kērt- ‘to turn, spin’. Rieken’s phonological objections to this derivation are not compelling, because final *-r is regularly lost in Anatolian after unaccented vowel (Melchert 1994:87 after Eichner and Yoshida), and *ḥērt-sör would regularly yield attested nom.-acc. karza. Since the word was plurale tantum, there would have been no source within the paradigm from which to restore the final *-r, and the regular result karza would have remained.

The problem with the proposed derivation from a *-sör, *sn- is not the presumed historical phonology, but rather the very dubious status of a PIE unitary heteroclite suffix *-ser/*-sen- (see Rieken 1999:386 with references).10 Nor do Indic and Greek infinitives reflecting a formant *-sen(i) assure the existence of a true suffix *-sen that could be the basis for a paradigm in *-sör(n), *-sn-. We may therefore follow

---

8 I would opt rather for the alternative analysis of Nussbaum, loc. cit., namely that *-sen(i) originated as a locative in *-en to s-stems as did both the Sanskrit and Hittite types being discussed, except that no full zero/-n- “heteroclite” paradigm was ever created (much less one in -eš(n)-). See further below in the conclusion.

9 Meaning thus against Melchert 1999! The word refers to a wooden frame that may come in a wide variety of shapes that assists a single person in winding a skein of yarn (in lieu of the well-known technique of using the upraised arms of another person) and on which the skein can then be conveniently moved around (see the passages I cited). The Hittite plural tantum reflects that the typical karzan- consisted of several assembled pieces. Whether the hieroglyphic sign *314 (phonetic value likely bā) with its three loops may also be interpreted as a kind of swift may be left open.

10 I am not persuaded by the claim of Jasano (2000/3:162–3) that the Greek infinitive (ἐ)ἀγάναι ‘to break’ proves the existence of a heteroclite paradigm with a nom.-acc. *mągẹ– (i.e. *męgẹ–). The existence of Hitt. *muqtal ‘bite-sized bread’ (or similar) is pure coincidence. The meaning argues that it is merely one of the many Hittite deverbal derivatives in -išlar (< *muq- ‘to bite’).
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Rieken (1999:391–2) in deriving GI Susp karzan- from a heteroclite s-stem: virtual *kér-s, *k(e)r-t-s-n-. Rieken takes nom.-acc. plural karz-a as containing the productive ending -a < *eh₂. I do not exclude this possibility, but tend to prefer an alternative suggestion from Alan Nussbaum: the Sanskrit r/n-heteroclite āhar, āhm- ‘day’ shows a nom.-acc. plural āhā(ni) with the stem of the weak singular. One may thus assume in parallel fashion for our heteroclitic *kér-t-s, *kér-t-s-n- a holokinetic n-stem plural *kér-só, which would lead regularly to attested karza (compare Old Hittite nom.-acc. plural NINDA šaṛama to šaṛaman- ‘bread ration’ < *má, as seen by Gertz 1982:298–9). Synchronously in fact GI Susp karzan- with a nom.-acc. karza can only be analyzed as an n-stem plural tautum.

As described below, strictly speaking a preform *k(e)r-t-s-n- would have led to a Hittite form with anaptyxis and shift of accent: ʰkarzen-. However, the real pre-Hittite paradigm may well have already had a leveled accent and vocalism: *kér-s-n- would have led to the attested karzan- (see below on pars(a)na- ‘leopard’). Alternatively, the aberrant plural tautum paradigm karza, *karzen- may have been altered analogically after real n-stems.

Taking this reconstruction as a working hypothesis, we may then ask what would have been the outcome in Hittite of such a paradigm to a root ending in a sequence *-RT where *T was not a coronal stop, that is, for a putative s-stem *hvH-g-s, *hv(e)g-s-n- ‘branching plant, bush’. The answer for the nominative-accusative is fairly certain: *alkiš, with the well established anaptyxis in a final cluster *K-s# seen in preterite third singulars such as akkiš ‘died’ < *ak₂-s, hwappiš ‘hurled’ etc. (see Oettinger 1979:41 and Melchert 1994:174). The fate of the weak stem is a far more complicated matter. A complete discussion of consonant clusters and the conditioning for anaptyxis in Hittite is not possible here, but significant improvements can be made to the quite inadequate treatment in Melchert (1994:174–5).

There is evidence to support the conclusion that a prehistoric anaptyctic vowel to the left of the original accent regularly drew the accent and was thereby lengthened in an open syllable, while a post-tonic anaptyctic vowel remained unaccented: contrast piminis- ‘to interrogate’ < *pim(e)uH-s (thus with LIV2 489 after Hardarson; similarly Oettinger 1976a:95, Eichner 1978:160, Kimball 1999:199) versus tuh-lu-ui-zi beside tu-ub-iša ‘cuts off, separates’ < *diuh₂- (Oettinger 1976b:133–4 and Kimball 1999:199). Likewise we find téri- ‘three’ < *tréi- (accent *tréi- assured by CLuv. tarriyanallī ‘third in command’) and teripp- ‘to plow’ < *trép- versus takkišši ‘puts together’ < *tekš-ti, where the post-tonic *e in a closed syllable regularly becomes i (compare Oettinger 1979:41). One may therefore also derive Hittite parsēna- ‘hip; cheek’ < *pers mó-él₂ (Oettinger 1982:172 n. 40)."
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There is a similar prehistoric pretonic anaptyxis in imperfective stems in *-sk̂e/ó- formed from stems in a final consonant, but unsurprisingly the regular retraction of the accent is blocked in this productive formation under pressure of stems without anaptyxis (such as da-šk̂eni < da- ‘to take’, memi-šk̂eni < memi- ‘to speak’, akku-šk̂esi < e/aku- ‘to drink’, ari-šk̂enun < ariya- ‘to make an oracle inquiry’). The anaptyctic *e thus appears regularly as i in pretonic position (Melchert 1994:139). Contra Melchert (1994:150) and Kassian and Yakubovich (2002:37–40) there are examples to show that prehistorically there was anaptyxis in all sequences of *-VC-sk̂e/ó- except those in *-Vsk̂e/ó- (the alleged stem hūšıkke- to hūš-/hēš- ‘to open’ does not exist, as shown by Kloekhorst 2008:322). Since Hittite speakers could at any time newly derive the fully productive imperfective stem from the synchronic base, the forms with anaptyxis are subject to replacement at varying stages of the language (see the summaries in Oettinger 1979:18–22 and Kimball 1999:198–9).15

1 Stems in coronal sonorant: hāšıkke- < hann(a)- ‘to litigate; judge’ (renewed by hannıkike- and hannákake-); āršıkke- < arr(a)- ‘to wash’ (renewed by ārrıkike- and ārráake-); τaršıkkke- < tar- ‘to say’ (renewed by tarr(a)ıkke-); τaršıkke- < tarna- ‘to release’ (renewed by tarrınike- and tarnaške-).14

2 Stems in coronal sonorant plus *s: ānsıkke- < ānsi- ‘to wipe’ (renewed by a-an-əške- /anske- and ānsıkke-); karšıkke- < karši- ‘to cut’ (renewed by kar(ar)ske-).

3 Stems in coronal sonorant plus stop: reduplicated mammalzkınta < malδ- ‘vow’, cited by Oettinger 1979:322 (always renewed in the base verb as malz(a)ke-; likewise only attested is hũ(ua)rš(a)ke- < hũ(ua)r̂- ‘curse’).15

4 Stems in coronal stop: azzıkke- < e/ad- ‘to eat’ and hazıkke- < ḥatt- ‘strike’.16

with similar anaptyxis is made problematic by the single j- (see Melchert 1994:174–5) and the Old Script gen. sg. p[i]nā. One should therefore follow the attractive analysis by Zucha (1988:33–4) and Carruba (1993) and assume an original hysteronkinetic n-stem: *p-es-ıw-, “p(i)e-n”, from which all forms of the attested Hittite paradigm may be derived.

14There is no trace of anaptyxis in *-šk̂e/ó- stems built to roots of the shape *K(ı)R-s: we find only k(a)waške- < ku(ı)e- ‘to strike, slay’ and kuwar(a)ške- < ku(ı)e- ‘to cut’ (later renewed as karr(a)ške- and karrıške-). We may thus infer that at the time of the prehistoric anaptyxis rule the zero-grade of these stems was still *KR- and thus no anaptyxis occurred. Later, as established by Kloekhorst (2007:456), the sequences *KR-šk̂e-developed regularly to attested k(a)waške- (via *k(a)wašike-) and k(a)warıške-.

15A failure to adequately distinguish older and newer forms to the same base fatally undermines the conclusions of the otherwise very useful treatment by Kavitskaya 2001.

16For MS taršıkktena- and taršıkkkeni belonging to tarna- see Kimball 1999:198 and Kloekhorst 2008:846. I assume with Kimball *τar(K)nsıkke/o- > *τrnsıkke/ó- and anaptyxis either before or after loss of the -n-, contra Kloekhorst. In the case of (u)wanıške- < wen- ‘future’ the expected *wanıške- has had the -n- restored from the base verb. For the development of *ŵ[n]-ske- > *wanıške- see Kloekhorst 2008:1000 and also 2007, as referenced in note 12 above.

Oettinger’s statement (1979:322) that the anaptyctic vowel never splits the *y of the -ske- obviously is a lapsus, since it does in tarrıške-, mammalzkınta, and both azzıkke- and hazıkke-.

Since the archaic ālšuške- ‘to put’ did not have a preceding syllable and since /tsC/- is an acceptable onset in Hittite (cf. zaš/mni- ‘dream’ [tsxi/ay-]), the regular outcome here was OH/OS zaške- [tsk̂-] (thus correctly Kloekhorst 2008:808). The standard form ziške- is analogical to azzıkke- etc.
H. Craig Melchert

(5) Stems in labial or dorsal stop: appiške- < e/app- ‘to take’; terippiške- < teripp- ‘to plow’; akkiške- < akk- ‘to die’; h˘ukkiške- < h˘uek- ‘to exorcize’.


(7) Stems in *bh- and sonorant + *b-: maniyah˘h˘iške- < maniyah˘- ‘hand over’, šanh˘iške- < šanh˘- ‘search, seek’. The i-vocalism of the anaptyctic vowel here is clearly analogical to the regular outcome of pretonic *e in the other forms as i. Compare likewise pret. 3rd sg. maniyah˘h˘iš after akkiš etc.

It is entirely unclear to me why the position of the anaptyctic vowel is different after stems in coronals than after those in non-coronals. Any account of this requires a thorough analysis of the general rules of Hittite (and pre-Hittite!) syllabification that cannot be undertaken here. The relevant finding for our immediate problem is clear enough: we predict that in a sequence *h₁(e)lK-s-n- the anaptyxis would have been between the non-coronal stop and the *s. Whether the normal retraction of the accent in pretonic anaptyxis would have operated undisturbed is less certain.

Mobile accent between root and ending in nominal paradigms is generally recessive in Hittite. However, aside from the isolated archaic neuter noun aii, iš- ‘mouth’, where OS spellings such as išši, išša, and iššaz assure us of a mobile accent, and animate kèsšar(iš) vs. kèsra, kèsrt ‘hand’, virtually all other evidence for accent shift between root and ending in nouns comes precisely from those with oblique stems in -n-: archaic ablauting têkan, taknt, tânnašt, tágnaz ‘earth, ground’ and èšhar, èšhûnšt, èšhûnt ‘blood’, pišn-, pišnâšt ‘man’ (see note 11 above); lammar, lamni ‘moment, instant’; ša-gan, šaknâšt ‘oil, fat’. On the other hand, one may also note that in all of the examples cited the suffix is simple *-n(V)n-. I know of no evidence for preserved mobile accent between root and ending in nouns with complex suffixes in -n-: that is, the types of mèhr, mèhûn- ‘time’; verbal nouns in -war with gen. sg. -wâi (and related ininitive in -wanzi and “supine” in -wan); àšwar, àšûm- ‘sheepfold’; abstracts in -atar, -ann-. I leave aside the type of verbal abstracts in -èsšar, -èsšn- because by one derivation of these the argument would be circular (see appendix).

We may therefore reasonably entertain the possibility that the regular accent retraction applied in the pretonic anaptyxis of *h₁(e)lK-s-n-, leading to oblique *alkešn- beside nom.-acc. *alhis. We would not expect either this new mobile accent or the vocalic alternation to survive long in such a paradigm, and I suggest that our attested class showing either -êś, -êšn- or -iš, -išn- results from competing leveling of the irregular paradigm produced by the two different anaptyxis rules, each of which I stress is independently motivated for pre-Hittite. As indicated earlier, the two leveled types then attracted a few stems with original *-is- and *-ëš- to the inflectional type with weak stem in -ššn-.

1I am not aware of any examples with root-final *m- or *mP-. One would predict anaptyxis between these and the following *s of the suffix.
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The PIE status of heteroclite stems in zero/-n- remains doubtful. Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954:78) regards the Sanskrit type as an innovation. Nussbaum (1986:161–2) cites examples beyond Sanskrit, but concludes that the class was modeled after -r/-n- and -l/-n- heteroclites, probably in the history of the individual languages. There are in fact no compelling word equations, and the formal and semantic features of the Sanskrit group (mostly but not entirely s-stems, mainly but not exclusively body parts) only very partially overlap with those of the Hittite examples. This mismatch supports the assumption of parallel but independent creations.

Nussbaum (1986:200ff.) argued that Sanskrit s-stems in zero/-n- were modeled on the -r/-n- heteroclite type, starting from locatives in *en. That the locative singular would be the pivotal form in a set of nouns for body parts is plausible, and the pattern of *asən(i) beside *əsn, *əmə, *əsnə in ‘mouth’ does bear a striking resemblance to udən(i) beside udnə, udnəs in ‘water’ or (aside from the accent) áhan(i) beside ámnə, ašmə, ašnas in ‘day’.

We know that Hittite did inherit some neuter s-stems with zero grade of the suffix: beside karz(an)- ‘swift’ cited above there is also kar-ai (whose “broken spelling” shows that it was a monosyllabic /kars/), a neuter noun for a type of wheat, reflecting *kėrykʷa- ‘grain, fodder’, base of derived hysterokinetic Lat. Cerēs, the goddess of grain (Schindler 1975:63). Since Hittite clearly maintained and even extended heteroclity of the -r/-n- type, it is unsurprising that it too created on this model a zero/-n- inflection of some s-stems. While later accretion has left the Hittite class semantically diverse, a pivotal role for the locative is likewise plausible for the two likely oldest examples *alkiš- ‘bush’ and karzan- ‘swift’, as well as several of the others: ḫattar‘road-fork’, kuppis- ‘stool’, taces- ‘assemblage’, tunmakkiš- ‘inner chamber’.

The differences between the Sanskrit and Hittite types are to be expected. In Hittite the word for ‘water’ maintained a very complex ablauting paradigm: nom.-acc. sg. wātar, loc. sg. witeni (and analogically gen. sg. witenai and inst. witenit), archaic inst. wedand(a), nom.-acc. pl. wītar. This made it (and similar nouns) unsuitable as a model for the s-stem class, and hence there is no trace of the -en of witeni (from old *ud-Čn(i)) in the s-stem heteroclites, where the dative-locative singular is -ešš-n-i with -n- as in all the other oblique cases. This pattern follows that of the productive r/n-stems in Hittite, which likewise show only -n-: -ātar, -ann- < *-at-n-; -ēšar, -ēšn-; -ur, -un-; -ēwar, -ēm-<.20 In cases where the -s was preceded by a non-coronal obstruent,

---

[18] Windisch (1894:74–1) cites beside Skt. déu/dár-n- ‘for corn’ OIr. gen. pl. doth to do Bh ‘am’ < *dhe(n)(V)n-, reminiscent of Gk. ἀρίστος or ἀριστόν. However, the chronology of do-n- in Sanskrit is unfavorable to an archaism, and the Old Irish word may just as well contain a genuine suffix *-Vn-.

[19] This analysis of the Hittite is due to Schindler, class instruction ca. 1976. The existence of Cerēs makes it superior to the popular alternative of an otherwise unattested root noun to *gh(e)rs- *‘spiny plant’ (Rieken 1999:64, after Hutter; in modified form also Kloekhorst 2008:444–5). Since the word is not attested outside the nominative-accusative, we do not know whether it had an added -n- in the oblique cases or not.

[20] Stems in */-nr/, */-n- did maintain oblique cases reflecting e-grade (”supines” in -wn-, infinitives in -wansai), but in this class the development of the gen. sg. */-n-s to -wai beside nom.-acc. -war would have prevented them from serving as models for the s-stems.
the anapyxis rules described above led to the mildly productive Hittite type in -e/iš, -e/iššn-.

Appendix

See Rieken (1999:385) for a summary of previous proposed accounts of the Hittite abstract/action nouns in -eššar, -eššn-. She herself (1999:403) argues that these are formed from an *-és, *-és-n- type by addition of *-r to the nominative-accusative in pre-Hittite, surely after the class in -ätar, -ann- (< *-atn-) with which they are closely associated.\(^2\)

That the entire type in -eššar, -eššn- is a specifically pre-Hittite innovation is shown by the fact that there is no corresponding type in Luvian. One of the great merits of Starke 1990 is to have shown just how robust heteroclite r/n-inflection is in Luvian (see there 433–572), but there is no trace whatsoever of a heteroclite type in -Vššar, -Vššn-. This absence also furnishes another reason to doubt the existence—at least in Anatolian—of a complex suffix *-s(e)r, *-s(e)n-.

There remains the question of why the productive type in -eššar, -eššn- shows the accented e-grade variant of our originally alternating type in *-is, *-ém-. Here other factors may have played a determining role. Oettinger (1986:12) already pointed out the coexistence of dannatēšš- ‘become empty’ beside dannatēššar ‘emptiness’, parkuešš- ‘become pure’ beside parkueššar ‘purity’, etc. and suggested a denominative origin for the entire class, with the more widespread deverbal type being secondary. This seems unlikely for the origin of the type for reasons given above, but the pattern Oettinger identified may have been decisive in promoting the accented *-és- variant.

Beside the denominative type of fientive verb in -ēš- there were also some deverbatives, e.g. ātešš- ‘become dry’ beside āt- ‘dry (up)’ (intr.). More importantly, some examples would have been ambiguous as to whether they were deverbal or denominative (see the just remark of Jasanoff 2002:3:147 that at some level the distinction is artificial or at least epiphenomenal). To the root *bherghī ‘high’ Hittite attests a u-stem adjective parku- ‘high’, an abstract pargeššar* (inst. pargešnit) beside better attested pargatar and pargašti- ‘height’ and verbal stems park(iya)- ‘rise; raise’, parknu- ‘raise’, parkeššar ‘height’ and verbal stems park(iya)- ‘rise; raise’, parknu- ‘raise’, parkeššar ‘height’. A similar constellation surrounds palhī- ‘broad’. Thus an original *bhēryhīs-, *bhēryhīs-n- would have led as per above to pre-Hittite *bārgis, *bārgesn-. The coexistence of *bargēss- < *bhēryhīs-n- would have favored generalization in the noun to *bargēs, *bargēsn-. Then as per Rieken the nominative-accusative was extended in pre-Hittite by *-r after the type in -ätar, *-ātm-. Furthermore, both parkēššar and pargešši- may have been reanalyzed as derived from parku-, not from the verbal base. This would have led to the formation of unambiguously denominative examples like dannatteššar and dannatteššār.

\(^2\)This systematic pre-Hittite addition of *-r in the nominative-accusative must be kept quite separate from the very sporadic post-Old Hittite alteration of the zero/-n- type: e.g. tunnakteššar remade from OHitt./OS tunnakteš.
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